DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 230 FL 008 801

AUTHOR Romero, Christian
TITLE E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; Curriculum; Educational Policy; *Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Language Teachers; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Education Professions Development Act; Kansas

ABSTRACT

Inservice bilingual education is one of many ways that can be used to help educational institutions make changes necessary to meet the educational needs of the linguistically and culturally diverse students, as well as to bring about an overall enrichment in educational systems throughout the nation. This report describes the sequence of activities, objectives, and statistical evaluation of an inservice approach to bilingual education, which was held at Garden City, Kansas, June 30, 1976, through July 20, 1976. The E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators was funded by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under Part E of the Education Professions Development Act and sponsored by Kansas State University. This report on the E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators is presented in three parts: (1) events leading up to the Institution, (2) specific information regarding the Institute, and (3) evaluative data collected following the Institute. The design and structure of the E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators came about as a result of a needs assessment conducted in various southwestern Kansas communities. The evaluative data which was subjected to statistical procedure showed an apparent success in meeting the needs of the participants. (Author/CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143230

E.P.D.A. INSTITUTE FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATORS

by

Christian Romero
Assistant Professor

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

FL008801

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christian Romero

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

E.P.D.A. INSTITUTE FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATORS

Introduction

Bilingual Education through in-service approaches is one of many ways that can be used for helping our educational institutions make changes necessary to meet the educational needs of the linguistically and culturally diverse students, as well as bringing about an overall enrichment in our educational system throughout the nation. This report describes the sequence of activities, objectives, and statistical evaluation of an in-service approach to bilingual education, which was held at Garden City, Kansas, June 30, 1976, through July 20, 1976. The E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators was funded by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under Part E of the Education Professions Development Act and sponsored by Kansas State University.

The report for E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators is presented in three parts: (1) events leading up to the Institution, (2) specific information regarding the Institute, and (3) evaluative data collected following the Institute. The design and structure of the E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators came about as a result of a needs assessment conducted in various southwestern Kansas communities. The evaluative data which was subjected to statistical procedure showed an apparent success in meeting the needs of the participants.

Pre-Institute Events

During the Spring Semester 1976, the Director of the Institute for Bi-

lingual Educators met with representatives from U.S.D. 457, Garden City Community Junior College, Dodge City Community Junior College, and Seward Community Junior College in order to initiate a needs assessment plan to help in the formulation of the E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators. Follow-up meetings were held with potential participant and community representatives as the structure for the Institute was finalized.

E.P.D.A. Institute General Objectives and Activities

The E.P.D.A. Institute general objectives for participants are as follows:

1) distinguish among the range of perspectives and approaches to bilingual multicultural education
2) recognize intergroup relations as it applies to bilingual multicultural curricular studies
3) synthesize and evaluate bilingual education materials for adaptation and utilization in the classroom
4) compare and describe various assessment and evaluation instruments used with the bilingual child
5) examine bilingualism and bilingual education in the United States
6) construct culturally and linguistically appropriate curricular designs for bilingaul education
7) investigate the applications of "English as a Second Language Methodology"
8) compare and contrast at least two language systems
9) investigate equal education opportunity legislation mandates, including the "Lau remedies"
10) recognize and develop strategies to facilitate creativity in the students

Outline of the Program Content and Activity
(for a more detailed description see Appendix B)

I. Perspectives and approaches in bilingual multicultural education

II. Intergroup relations with implication and reference to curriculum studies

III. Materials selection and adaptation for bilingual multicultural education

IV. Bilingualism and bilingual education in the United States

V. Strategies for developing culturally and linguistically appropriate curriculum designs

VI. Theory and methodology for English as a second language

VII. Contrastic linguistics (English-French-Spanish)

VIII. Teaching strategies for language learning

IX. Counseling the bilingual student

X. Creativity in education

XI. Bilingual bicultural education as an effective response for quality education

XII. A communications and collaborations panel discussion composed of community representatives, school board members, school administrators, teachers from the elementary schools, secondary schools, and community college

XIII. Field trip to bilingual educational sites

Evaluative Data

The evaluation of the Institute by each participant was compiled and the data subjected to statistical procedure which included the analysis of the program characteristics, participants' personal perceptions of the program, and the consultants' characteristics. The overall quality of the Institute was then determined through summation of the three areas, as well as item analysis on each question of the Program Evaluation Instrument (see Tables I and II).

The data regarding the quality of the E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators were obtained from administration of a Program Evaluation Instrument (PEI) based on the semantic differential method and uses a five point Likert-type response

scale. The PEI is a modified form of the Program Evaluation Questionnaire prepared by the Midwest Center for Equal Education Opportunity (see Appendix A).

The PEI consists of three parts: A) Personal characteristics; B) Personal perceptions; and C) consultant characteristics.

In determining the quality of the program experience, an analysis of the summation of parts A and B of the PEI was made which indicates the perception of the program experience under a variety of conditions. Parts A and B consists of fourteen items with a five point Likert-type response scale. Coefficient Alpha for summation A and B is 0.8403. A summation of part C, which consists of seven items with a five point Likert-type response scale indicates that participants' perception of the quality of consultants. Determination of the coefficient Alpha for part C gave a figure of 0.4911.

The data obtained from the PEI are presented in Tables I and II. The analysis of these data indicate the overall quality of the Institute. The following classification system was adopted in conjunction with the PEI in an effort to improve the quality of program assessment. Scores obtained from part A and B of the Program Evaluation Instrument were placed in the following categories:

1. Acceptable -- the obtained score minus 2 standard error units is greater than 50.
2. Questionable -- the obtained score is within two standard error units of 50.
3. Unacceptable -- the obtained score plus 2 standard error units is less than 50.

Scores obtained from part C (consultant evaluation) of the Program Evaluation Questionnaire were classified as follows:

1. Acceptable -- the obtained score minus 2 standard error units is greater than 26.

Table I: Analysis of Parts A & B

Responses of E.P.D.A. Institute Participants to
P.E.I. Items, 1 through 14
(perceptions of program experience under a variety of conditions)

Program Characteristics (A)

	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(NR)	Mean	S.D.	S.E.
1.	63.3*	33.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.600	0.563	0.103
2.	40.0	53.3	3.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.267	0.828	0.151
3.	73.3	23.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.700	0.535	0.098
4.	50.0	46.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	4.517	0.509	0.094
5.	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.833	0.397	0.069
6.	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.900	0.305	0.056
7.	56.7	36.7	3.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.433	0.858	0.157

Personal Perceptions (B)

8.	53.3	33.3	6.7	0.0	3.3	3.3	4.379	0.903	0.168
9.	50.0	40.0	6.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	4.367	0.765	0.140
10.	63.3	23.3	10.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	4.467	0.829	0.150
11.	76.7	13.3	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.667	0.661	0.121
12.	46.7	46.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.400	0.621	0.113
13.	43.3	40.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.267	0.740	0.135
14.	90.0	6.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.867	0.434	0.079

*Responses in Percentages

Mean Score 63.70
Standard deviation 5.91
Standard Error 1.08
Coefficient Alpha (A+B) 0.8403

Table II: Analysis of Part C

Responses of E.P.D.A. Institute Participants to
P.E.I. Items 15 through 21
(consultant characteristics)

	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(NR)	Mean	S.D.	S.E.
15.	86.7*	6.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	3.3	4.862	0.441	0.082
16.	60.0	33.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.533	0.629	0.115
17.	43.0	46.7	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.333	0.661	0.121
18.	56.7	33.3	6.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	4.433	0.774	0.141
19.	30.0	40.0	26.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	3.967	0.850	0.155
20.	76.7	20.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.733	0.521	0.095
21.	63.3	30.0	6.7	6.0	0.0	0.0	4.567	0.626	0.114

*Responses in Percentages

Mean Score 31.43
Standard Deviation 6.10
Standard Error 1.12
Coefficient 0.6911

2. Questionable -- the obtained score is within 2 standard error units of 26.

3. Unacceptable -- the obtained score plus 2 standard error units is less than 26.

The Program Evaluation Instrument parts A and B consists of 14 items (see Table I, page 5) with a possible range of scores from a maximum of 70 to a minimum of 14. In Table I (page 5) is shown the distribution of scores which gives a minimum score of 44.94 and a maximum score of 70.00. The mean score for the Program Evaluation Instrument parts A and B was 63.70 with a standard deviation of 5.91. The mean was determined by summing all the scores from 44.94 to 70.00 and dividing by the number of participants (30). The grand mean for all items on parts A and B of the PEI was found by summing the item means and dividing this by 14, the number of items for parts A and B. The grand mean for all items was 4.55 with 1.00 being the lowest possible rating and 5.00 being the highest possible rating.

Analysis of part C of the PEI indicates the quality of the consultants. Part C of the PEI consists of 7 items with a possible range of scores from a maximum of 35 to a minimum of 7. The mean score for the consultants which was calculated from Table II, page 6 is 31.43.

Upon applying the program classification system stated on page 4 the obtained score for parts A and B of the PEI was 63.70 with a standard error of 1.08. The obtained score 63.70 minus 2 standard error units (2.16) is equal to 61.54 which is well above the required 50 in order to be in the acceptable range of the classification system. The obtained score for the consultants was 31.43 with a standard error of 1.12. The obtained score of 31.43 minus 2 standard error units equals 29.19, well above the required 26 to be acceptable.

Based on the data presented above it seems apparent that the E.P.D.A. Institute For Bilingual Educators was a success in meeting the needs of the participants.

Conclusion

In meeting the educational needs of the linguistically and culturally diverse student, a first step should be quality education for equipping the teachers and school administrators with competencies which are essential for educating all children and especially include a large number of students who heretofore have been excluded from the benefits of our educational system.

The apparent success of the E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators held at Garden City, Kansas, during the Summer of 1976 is indicative of the tremendous potential that bilingual education has for helping our educational institutions restructure so they can better meet the educational needs of all students.

This paper has been written in the spirit of contributing to the exchange of ideas and information about bilingual education. While activity in the area of bilingual education has permeated throughout our nation in the last decade, there is a need for more analysis and documentation of such activity, so that the sharing of information may be made most meaningful in helping to bring about quality education for all.

References

1. Edelfelt, R. A. and Margo Johnson, ed., Rethinking In-Service Education, National Education Association Publication, Washington, D. C., 1975.

2. Harris, B. M. and W. Bessent, In-Service Education: A Guide to Better Practice, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

3. Kerlinger, F. N., Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York University, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.

4. Maertens, N., Preparation and Internship Training for Educators for Staff Development Roles for Community Colleges (Application for financial support under Part E of the Educational Professions Development Act, P. L. 90-35), Kansas State University, 1975.

5. Midwest Center for Equal Education Opportunity, Program Experience Questionnaire, University of Missouri.

6. Romero, C., Final Report for E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators (Final report on grant contract #G00-75-01982) submitted to U. S. Department of H.E.W., Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Kansas State University, 1976.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

(PEI)

PROGRAM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
(PEI)

Directions for Responding

In order to assist us in assessing the effectiveness of this program, you are being asked to anonymously indicate your evaluation on this form.

Directions: Below are a series of statements about the program activities which you have just completed. These statements are intended to make the description of your experiences in these activities quick and simple. Each statement is followed by a rating scale between two extreme reactions. Mark the numeral on the scale which comes the closest to describing the way you feel. See the example below for further clarification.

Example: The coffee was:
excellent (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) bad

****

1. The program objectives were:
well defined (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) vague

2. I feel the program objectives were attained:
fully (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) not at all

3. The overall quality of this program was:
high (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) low

4. The number of topics presented during this program was:
just right (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) insufficient

5. The presentations and activities of this program were:
beneficial (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) not beneficial

6. The staff's interest and enthusiasm for the program content was:
high (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) low

7. The material presented during this program was:
applicable (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) not applicable

8. My expectations for this program were:
fulfilled (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) unfulfilled

9. Interaction between the program staff and myself was:
high (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) low

10. Interaction between other participants and myself was:
high (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) low

11. My self-awareness was:
expanded (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) unchanged

12. My reception of the values expressed by others was:
open (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) closed

13. I feel I will utilize the material presented in this program:
fully (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) not at all

14. I would recommend this program to others:
fully (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) not at all

15. The Instructor's knowledge of the program content was:
high (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) low

16. The Instructor's helpfulness to program participants was:
great (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) little

17. The Instructor's helpfulness to me was:
great (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) little

18. The Instructor's tolerance of differing points of view was:
high (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) low

19. The Instructors provided enough time for questions and clarifying remarks.
strongly agree (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) strongly disagree

20. The Instructor was interesting and enthusiastic.
strongly agree (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) strongly disagree

21. I recommend this Instructor to others.
strongly agree (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) strongly disagree

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE FOR THE E.P.D.A. INSTITUTE

FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATORS

June 14, 1976

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE FOR THE E.P.D.A. INSTITUTE
FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATORS

WEDNESDAY, June 30, 1976

9:00 - 3:00 REGISTRATION AND ENROLLMENT

Lobby of Administration Building
Garden City Community College
Garden City, Kansas

THURSDAY, July 1, 1976

9:00 - 10:00 WELCOME AND ORIENTATION TO THE INSTITUTE

Dr. Asel Harder, Dean of Instruction
Garden City Community College

Dr. Christian Romero, Director
E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators

Ms. Alicia Opheim, Assistant Director
E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators

Mr. Alfonso López-Vasquez, Assistant Director
E.P.D.A. Institute for Bilingual Educators

THURSDAY, July 1, 1976

10:00 - 12:00 — BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: THE RANGE OF PERSPECTIVES AND APPROACHES

Dr. María Medina Swanson, Director
Title VII Midwest Resource Center

Dr. Guillermo De Hoogh Oteo, Consultant
Title VII Midwest Resource Center

12:00 - 1:30 — Lunch

1:30 - 3:30 — BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: THE RANGE OF PERSPECTIVES AND APPROACHES

Dr. María Medina Swanson

Dr. Guillermo De Hoogh Oteo

FRIDAY, July 2, 1976

9:00 - 12:00 — INTERGROUP RELATIONS WITH IMPLICATIONS AND REFERENCE TO CURRICULUM STUDIES

Dr. James Boyer, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education
Kansas State University

FRIDAY, July 2, 1976

12:00 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 3:30 INTERGROUP RELATIONS WITH IMPLICATIONS AND REFERENCE TO CURRICULUM STUDIES

Dr. James Boyer

SATURDAY, July 3, 1976

Free Time for Participants

SUNDAY, July 4, 1976

Free Time for Participants

MONDAY, July 5, 1976

Free Time for Participants

TUESDAY, July 6, 1976

9:00 - 12:00 — BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION MATERIALS SELECTION AND ADAPTATION

Dr. María Medina Swanson, Director
Title VII Midwest Resource Center

Dr. Guillermo De Hoogh Oteo, Consultant
Title VII Midwest Resource Center

12:00 - 1:30 — Lunch

1:30 - 3:30 — ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF THE BILINGUAL CHILD

Dr. María Medina Swanson

Dr. Guillermo De Hoogh Oteo

WEDNESDAY, July 7, 1976

9:00 - 12:00 — AN OVERVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT 457, GARDEN CITY, KANSAS

Mr. John Dickerson, Assistant Supt.
USD 457, Garden City, Kansas

Ms. Lydia Gonzales, DECO Disseminator
Garden City Community College

WEDNESDAY, July 7, 1976

12:00 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 3:30 PANEL DISCUSSION - EDUCATION IN THE GARDEN CITY COMMUNITY

THURSDAY, July 8, 1976

9:00 - 12:00 BILINGUALISM AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Rudy Rodriguez, Director, Bilingual Bicultural Education Program at Texas Women's University, Denton, Texas

12:00 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 3:30 BILINGUALISM AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Rudy Rodriguez

FRIDAY, July 9, 1976

9:00 - 12:00	STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY APPROPRIATE CURRICULAR DESIGNS Mr. Rudy Rodriguez
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 3:30	STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY APPROPRIATE CURRICULAR DESIGNS

SATURDAY, July 10, 1976

Free Time for Participants

SUNDAY, July 11, 1976

Free Time for Participants

MONDAY, July 12, 1976

9:00 - 12:00	THEORY AND METHODOLOGY FOR ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE Mr. Hector Zamorano, Counselor and Professor, Modern Languages, El Centro College, Dallas, Texas
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 3:30	CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS, ENGLISH/SPANISH/FRENCH Mr. Hector Zamorano

TUESDAY, July 13, 1976

9:00 - 12:00	CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS, ENGLISH/SPANISH/FRENCH Mr. Hector Zamorano
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 3:30	TEACHING STRATEGIES FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING Mr. Hector Zamorano

THURSDAY, July 15, 1976

1:30 - 3:30 FIELD TRIP: Lakin Migrant Education Program

FRIDAY, July 16, 1976

Free Time for Participants

SATURDAY, July 17, 1976

Free Time for Participants

SUNDAY, July 18, 1976

Free Time for Participants

MONDAY, July 19, 1976

9:00 - 12:00	CREATIVITY IN EDUCATION Dr. Richard Owens, Professor of Education Kansas State University
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 3:30	CREATIVITY IN EDUCATION Dr. Richard Owens

TUESDAY, July 20, 1976

9:00 - 10:00	FUNCTIONS OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE AS IT RELATES TO BILINGUAL EDUCATION Mr. Ruben Corona, Executive Director Kansas Mexican American Advisory Committee
10:00 - 11:00	EQUAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY Mr. Tony Lopez, Executive Director Kansas Commission on Civil Rights

TUESDAY, July 20, 1976

11:00 - 12:00	BILINGUAL BICULTURAL EDUCATION: AN EFFECTIVE RESPONSE FOR QUALITY EDUCATION Dr. Henry Casso, Chief Educational Analyst, Legislative University Study Committee State of New Mexico
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 2:30	FUNCTIONS OF THE TOPEKA LULAC EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER AS IT RELATES TO BILINGUAL EDUCATION Mr. José Cordero, Program Director Topeka LULAC Education Service Center
2:30 - 3:30	EVALUATION